

09/821,126

MS160340.1

REMARKS

Claims 1-79 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. All pending claims are found at pages 2-19. Claims 1, 23, 30, 31, 33, 34, 42, 43, 64, and 72 have been amended herein. Claims 2, 24, and 44 have been cancelled herein. Applicants' representative acknowledges with appreciation that claims 5-9, 25-29, and 45-49 are indicated as being allowable if recast in independent form to include all limitations of respective base claim(s) and any intervening claim(s). It is believed such amendments are not necessary in view of the below-noted deficiencies of the cited reference *vis a vis* the claimed invention. However, applicants' representative reserves the option to amend such claims into independent form at a later date, if necessary. New claims 73-79 have been added to emphasize novel aspects of the subject invention discussed *infra*. These claims do not raise new issues requiring further search or undue effort by the Examiner, and therefore entry and consideration thereof is respectfully requested. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claim 42 Under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c)

Claim 42 stands objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. It is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 42 has been amended herein to place the claim in proper dependent form. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 10-14, 16-24, 30-34, 36-44, 50-54, 56-64 and 67-72 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 10-14, 16-24, 30-34, 36-44, 50-54, 56-64 and 67-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick *et al.* (U.S. 5,555,354). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Strasnick *et al.* fails to teach or suggest the subject invention as claimed.

09/821,126

MS160340.1

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, *the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 23, 43, 64, and 72) has been amended to recite a travel control system that couples the at least one of the workspace variables to the input drive control system based on *a navigation type, which comprises at least one of speed coupled flying, orbiting, object manipulation technique, ghost copy technique, possession navigation technique, inverse fog technique, inverse scaling technique, and ephemeral world compression*. Such amendments more particularly point out the applicants' invention and are supported by the specification (See pg. 8, ln. 24-25; pg. 10, ln. 27; pg. 11, ln. 15-16; pg. 13, ln. 1-2; pg. 13, ln. 25-26; pg. 14, ln. 27-28; pg. 15, ln. 11-12; pg. 15, ln. 26-27).

Strasnick *et al.* fails to teach or suggest that the *navigation type comprises at least one of speed coupled flying, orbiting, object manipulation technique, ghost copy technique, possession navigation technique, inverse fog technique, inverse scaling technique, and ephemeral world compression*. Strasnick *et al.* merely discloses free flight navigation, zoom navigation, marker navigation, and warp navigation. Free flight navigation is simply utilizing a mouse as a 3D joystick to navigate within the information landscape. (See col. 8, ln. 52-55). Zoom navigation enables a user to zoom an object when the mouse button is pressed over the object. (See col. 9, ln. 5-7). Marker navigation allows a navigator to mark particular locations and to return automatically when desired. (See col. 9, ln. 22-23). Warp navigation is simply zooming into a

09/821,126

MS160340.1

particular data object for close in viewing of the data object. (*See* col. 9, ln. 27-29).

The three-dimensional navigation types in applicants' subject claims are easier to employ and more useful than the navigation techniques disclosed in *Strasnick et al.* For example, traveling to an object far from the virtual body or camera utilizing free flight navigation is time consuming. (*See* pg. 1, ln. 20-22). Additionally, zoom navigation and warp navigation require that the object must be in the user's field of view for the user to navigate it. (*See* pg. 2, ln. 20-22). Conversely, the claimed invention provides improved navigation types to overcome such limitations.

In view of at least the above, applicants' representative respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 1, 23, 43, 64, and 72 (and dependent claims 2-4, 10-14, 16-22, 24, 30-34, 36-42, 44, 50-54, 56-63, and 67-71 which respectively depend therefrom) be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 15, 35 and 55 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15, 35 and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Strasnick et al.* (U.S. 5,555,354), in view of *Lengyel et al.* (U.S. 6,064,393). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The combination of *Strasnick et al.* and *Lengyel et al.* does not teach or suggest every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

As discussed *supra*, *Strasnick et al.* does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 23, and 43 from which claims 15, 35, and 55 respectively depend, and *Lengyel et al.* does not make up for these deficiencies of *Strasnick et al.* Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 65 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 65 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Strasnick et al.* (U.S. 5,555,354), in view of *Igarashi*. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The combination of *Strasnick et al.* and *Igarashi* does not teach or suggest every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

09/821,126

MS160340.1

As discussed *supra*, Strasnick *et al.* does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 64 from which claim 65 depends, and Igarashi does not make up for these deficiencies of Strasnick *et al.* Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claim 66 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 66 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick *et al.* (U.S. 5,555,354), in view of Zeleznik. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The combination of Strasnick *et al.* and Zeleznik does not teach or suggest every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

As discussed *supra*, Strasnick *et al.* does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 64 from which claim 66 depends, and Zeleznik does not make up for these deficiencies of Strasnick *et al.* Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

VII. New Claims 73-79

New claims 73-79 have been added herein to respectively emphasize various novel aspects of the subject invention discussed above in connection with limitations recited in the originally filed claims and discussed in detail *supra*. Accordingly, for at least the aforementioned reasons, entry and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

09/821,126

MS160340.1

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731